

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, et al.,

Defendants.

SYNOPSYS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,

Defendant.

Case No. C03-04669 MJJ (EMC)

Case No. C03-2289 MJJ (EMC)

**[PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING
DECEMBER 12, 2006 SUMMARY
JUDGMENT HEARING**

Judge: Martin J. Jenkins

At a Status Conference on October 12, 2006, the Court informed the parties of its intention to hear a subset of the already fully briefed summary judgment motions on December 12, 2006. The parties set forth their respective positions on the issues in letters to the Court dated October 20, 2006 [Dkt. No. 526, Case No. 03-2289] and October 23, 2006 [Dkt. Nos. 527 and 529, Case No. 03-2289]. Having considered those letters, and the respective positions of the parties, and finding good cause therefor, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Aeroflex agrees to entry of a stipulated judgment against it on its authorization and consent affirmative defense. The parties are to work out a proposed stipulated judgment on this issue as well as Ricoh's willfulness issue and present it to the Court by no later than November 15, 2006.

2. Synopsys and the Customer Defendants may file two revised summary judgment motions composed of text contained in the already-filed opening briefs, as described in its letter to the Court of October 23, 2006 [Dkt. No. 529, Case No. 03-2289]. These briefs may be no longer than 25 pages each, may not contain any arguments not already present in the current opening briefs, and must be filed with the Court within 2 court days of this order.

3. Within 1 weeks of the filing of the revised opening briefs, Ricoh shall file two opposition briefs composed of text contained in its already-filed opposition briefs.

4. Within 3 court days of the filing of the revised opposition briefs, Synopsys and the Customer Defendants shall file two reply briefs composed of text contained in its already-filed reply briefs.

The Court will consider the arguments presented by both sides in this revised briefing at the hearing scheduled for December 12, 2006.

DATED: _____

The Honorable Martin J. Jenkins
United States District Court Judge

Submitted by:

HOWREY LLP

By /s/ Denise M. De Mory
Attorneys for Plaintiff Synopsys
and for Defendants Aeroflex, Inc., et al.